

REMARKS

This Amendment is submitted in response to the Office Action dated March 27, 2003, having a shortened statutory period set to expire June 27, 2003. Claims 1-51 are pending. Applicants have amended Claims 1, 9, 17, 25, 33, 41, 49, 50, 51 and have canceled no Claims.

Claim Rejections -- 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-7, 9-15, 17-23, 25-31, 33-39 and 41-48 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), second section, as being unpatentable over *Jamtgaard et al.*, United States Patent No. 6,430,624 and further in view of *Chase et al.*, United States Patent No. 6,094,671. Those rejections are respectfully traversed insofar as they might be applied to the claims as amended and reconsideration of claims is requested.

Claims 8, 16, 24, 32, 40 and 48 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), eighth section, as being unpatentable over *Jamtgaard et al.*, United States Patent No. 6,430,624 and further in view of *Puri et al.*, United States Patent No. 6,148,330. Those rejections are respectfully traversed insofar as they might be applied to the claims as amended and reconsideration of claims is requested.

With respect to exemplary Claim 1, therein is included the elements of:

in response to the request from the first client system, sending a reduced-content page, corresponding to the first data page, to the first client system; and

in response to the request from the first client system, sending the first data page to a second client system used by a user of the first client system,

wherein the first client system communicates with the data processing system over a more expensive connection than the second client system communicates with the data processing system.

In other words, Claim 1 is a combination claim requiring that a reduced-content page be sent to the client's system over the expensive link and the full data page be sent to the client's other system connected with the less expensive link, both in response to a single request from the client. Or as explained in the preferred embodiment, sending reduced-content page to a user's


PDA or cell phone over a wireless link, and sending the full data page to the users home computer in an email connected with a dial-in, DSL or cable-type connection, both in response to a user request from the wireless device. This combination is not shown or suggested in the prior art.

With respect to the cited references, neither *Chase et al.* nor *Jamtgaard*, nor any combination of these references shows or suggests these elements of Claim 1. First, neither reference shows receiving a request for information and sending the information to both the requesting computer and a second designated computer used by the user. More particularly, nowhere does *Chase et al.* disclose sending a web page requested by a first computer to a different but related second computer. As can be seen in figure 1, *Chase et al.* discloses a "broadcast" capability (see column 6, line 32-37) to multiple computers, but there is no stated or inherent "user" relationship between the receiving computers. Moreover, the present invention of sending the information to a few, related computers is very different from this system that widely propagates information to many, unrelated computers. *Chase et al.* also discusses (in conjunction with figure 6) sending specifically requested information to a single source and single receiver system, but there is no mention of additionally sending a subset of the information to one of the user's other computers.

Second, Claim 1 recites three computer systems, where a first computer requesting data from a second computer receives reduced content, and the third computer, which is related to the first computer, receives the full-content page over a low cost link. This is not shown or suggested by *Chase et al.* or *Jamtgaard et al.* As *Chase et al.* describes at column 8, lines 13-27, connection 180 is a telephone link to provide feedback and other direct data transmission from the receiving station to the transmitting station, as needed. However, this only shows a secondary, low-cost communication link between the same two computer systems, not two different connections between one computer and two others.

Consequently, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of Claim 1 and withdrawal of the rejection under § 103. Also, for the reasons given above, Applicants submit that *Jamtgaard et al.* in view of *Chase et al.* do not show or suggest claims 2-51, and that those claims should also be reconsidered and the rejection under § 103 withdrawn.

Respectfully submitted,



Craig J. Yaddell

Reg. No. 39,083

BRACEWELL & PATTERSON, L.L.P.

P.O. Box 969

Austin, Texas 78767-0969

(512) 542-7800

ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANTS